Sequel to Pugwash: U.S. Press Ignores An Appeal from Leaders of Soviet Science, See Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. V, NO. 41 OCTOBER 28, 1957 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Back at the Brink, Despite Talk of Limited War

An important aspect of the Middle Eastern crisis, perhaps the most important, has gone unnoticed. This is the headlong abandonment of what was supposed to be our new strategy of limited war. Last August the Pentagon let it be known that our military thinking had shifted over to the views advanced by Henry A. Kissinger, a Joint Chiefs of Staff consultant, in his book on "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy." His study sought to find, in the tactics of limited nuclear war, "a course somewhere between Armageddon and surrender."

These views were echoed by Secretary Dulles in his famous article in the October *Foreign Affairs*. Mr. Dulles wrote that "the United States has not been content to rely upon a peace which could be preserved only by a capacity to destroy vast segments of the human race," a concept "acceptable only as a last alternative." Mr. Dulles said that fortunately "those who serve our nation in the field of science and weapon engineering" had developed tactical nuclear weapons which could be used "without vast destruction . . . to humanity" and would make it "feasible to place less reliance upon deterrence of vast retaliatory power." This was hailed in the headlines a few weeks ago as the abandonment of the massive retaliation doctrine.

Mac Arthurism Ascendant

But when Mr. Dulles was asked at press conference what we would do if there were an attack on Turkey by the Soviet Union, all this was brushed aside as if non-existent. He replied that our answer would not be "a purely defensive operation . . . with the Soviet Union a privileged sanctuary." In other words, we at once threatened all-out war. The phrase "privileged sanctuary" was MacArthur's and it reflected his bitter criticism of Mr. Truman's insistence on keeping the Korean war a limited conflict. The Kissinger book was in large part based on the Korean experience, and saw in it a means of retaining war as an instrument of policy without inviting the mutual suicide of all-out nuclear war. It was thought that Mr. Dulles agreed. But at the very first test, he leaped straight to the brink.

In passing one may wonder whether Mr. Dulles was making such life-and-death threats "off the cuff" or whether they reflected considered policy. The day after Mr. Dulles's press conference, Vice Admiral John H. Sides, the man in charge of the Navy's missile program, was boasting of the short range atomic rockets and cannon we already have in operational use and telling the press, (See Mark Watson's story in the *Baltimore Sun*, Oct. 19), "These are the kinds of weapons which will be used in any limited warfare, the kind which is far more probable than the all-out war." Does the Sixth fleet massed in the eastern Mediterranean have orders for the kind of limited war envisaged by Admiral Sides, or the massive retaliation threatened by Secretary Dulles?

War to the Last Turk?

We suggest that those who think limited nuclear war feasible take a long hard look at this picture. We do not believe the confusion can be attributed solely to Mr. Dulles's temperament. The difficulties run deeper. Will any ally be satisfied with a promise only of *limited* support? If the Russians bomb Istanbul or Ankara, would the Turks be satisfied with anything less than a counter-attack by air on Moscow or Odessa, even though the consequence might be a Soviet reprisal against Washington and New York? For the small ally, limited war is already total war. Given the power of modern weapons, a small country like Turkey can be wiped out overnight by nuclear attack from a great Power. To reply to such an attack by a purely defensive operation would become pretty close to meaningless. What would there be left to defend? Wouldn't it seem that the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. had a kind of gentlemen's agreement to fight out the war to the last Turk?

Of massive retaliation, Dr. Kissinger wrote, "It is a strange doctrine which asserts that vital interests can be defended only by the most catastrophic strategy." In suggesting limited nuclear war as an alternative, he stressed "the importance of diplomatic overtures which make clear that national survival is not at stake and that a settlement is possible on reasonable terms." This kind of willingness to negotiate is a necessity if the war is to be kept limited. How can we be sure the Russians will not bomb New York unless we promise not to bomb Moscow? How can we be certain Russian submarines will not bomb Texas oil fields unless we promise not to bomb those of Romania? Dr. Kissinger goes so far as to envisage mutual inspection in wartime to keep the conflict limited.

War Is Obsolete

On the other hand, if war can be kept limited only by negotiation, why not negotiate without war? The unwillingness to negotiate with Russia about a neighboring area so important to her strategically is the basic factor in the Middle Eastern crisis. How negotiate in war what we will not discuss in peace? The unwillingness to use the tools of diplomacy creates the blind alley, and if the situation is to be met by military threats—as both sides are now meeting it—the threats would be ludicrous if limited. The conclusion we draw is the folly of believing nuclear war can be limited, and that a wide range of new nuclear weapons somehow makes the hard work of negotiation unnecessary.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the UN: Britain Spreads Defeatism While India's Voice for Peace is Drowned Out

Krishna Menon: "We Are Really Discussing the Problem of Human Survival"

United Nations, N. Y.

India spoke for mankind as the debate on disarmament continued in the United Nations General Assembly, but mankind wasn't listening. The Nineteenth Century style growling among the great Powers over the Middle East drowned out the voice of reason. Krishna Menon, whom the U. S. press is orchestrated to hate and defame, told the Assembly gravely, "Although this subject is called disarmament, I think that it is important and useful for us at the very outset to reflect on it a little and see what we really dealing with. I would submit that in discussing this subject which had been discussed year after year—not to much purpose but to some purpose all the same—we are really discussing the problem of human survival. . . ." This made no headlines, but should be etched somewhere in stone.

The UN, Mr. Menon recalled, was founded to end "the scourge of war" but instead of progress there had been retrogression. On January 24, 1946, the Assembly called for the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction. Mr. Menon cited the resolutions in the years since which had repeated this demand. Now for the first time in ten years, Mr. Menon said, the Assembly had before it a resolution sponsored by great Powers "in which this problem of prohibition is eliminated." He referred to the Western proposals which envisage the continued distribution of atomic weapons to the smaller powers and the right to use them in "self-defense."

The Sovereign Right to Destroy Ourselves

Mr. Menon's sharpest irony was aimed at the British speech two days earlier. "We were told by the Secretary of State of the United Kingdom," he told the Assembly, "that the suspension or abandonment of explosions is not disarmament. We heartily agree. No one said it was disarmament. I do not think that even disarmament has any value. Disarmament is not peace; disarmament is only a step to peace. Disarmament is for the purpose of abandoning war. This is the first time in the history of this Assembly that a distinguished delegation has come forward and stood openly against suspension of tests. We are told that, if the tests are not continued, the bombs will be worse. What is more we are told about the sovereign rights of nations. I am glad that imperial nations are now sometimes willing to discuss the sovereign rights of other people. We are told it would be very wrong to deny to other countries the right to make bombs. Well, there are other things that they can do with their sovereignty rather than destroy the world."

The Indian representative, in calling for a cessation of tests with inspection machinery to police it, saw this first step as "a reversal of the engines of armament. It creates an atmosphere in the world. It creates, to a certain extent, the machinery of inspection, the machinery of give and take, of looking at each other's affairs to a certain degree; and that would work in other ways." He asked the Assembly to ask for a suspension of tests under a tripartite system of inspection as a first step toward relaxation of world tension.

Where India pleaded for peace, Britain pleaded, in effect, for continued testing and continued arms race. The West, it was evident from Mr. Noble's speech to the Assembly, can agree with the East but only when the East adopts in substance the same defeatist line that the drift toward nuclear war is irreversible. The British delegate accused the Soviet Union of being "more than a little cynical" in asking a ban on nuclear weapons. He quoted with relish a speech made by Marshal Zhukov at a Soviet military conference last March 16 when the Russian said atomic weapons "will come more and more to take the place of conventional arms and in the event of a major armed conflict are bound to be used as a fundamental striking agent." The British spokesman commented to the General Assembly, "Now this is perfectly sound military sense and I have no doubt that any General Staff would say the same."

Mr. Noble quoted with similar satisfaction from the Soviet proposals of last May 10 saying we had reached the point where the "possibilities . . . for organizing the clandestine manufacture of atomic and hydrogen weapons" were now "beyond the reach of international control." With this, too, the British delegate agreed, saying this was why the Western proposals "make no mention of the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons, together with the destruction of their stockpiles." Mr. Noble said it was impossible any longer to account for all existing weapons. This is a logic which leads to despair.

Old Delusion in New Guise

"Can it be that there are still in the world today advocates of the old dictum "Si vis pacem para bellum" [If you want peace, prepare for war]? . . . Preparations for war have never led to peace . . . the dictum itself reflected a state of international relations where war was a logical instrument of policy. . . . If then the formula has so clearly become untenable, can there be any real justification for the doctrine of retaliation or of deterrence? This doctrine is actually nothing but the old formula under a new guise. The theory . . . actually seeks to cloak the armaments race with a mantle of legality. . . . To be naive in my view is to believe in a type of security which is based on the possibility of all-out destruction, including the destruction of any way of life."

—Popovic (Yugoslavia) UN Assembly debate on arms.

Postscript—Just A Sideshow

Washington

As the world's third and newest nuclear power, Britain is deeply opposed to any cessation of tests until it has developed its own thermonuclear weapons more fully and built a greater stockpile. Not until then—when it may be too late—will it began to accentuate the positive; it is a fairly well known secret in Washington that Stassen had substantial White House support for a separate agreement on cessation of tests but that strong British opposition reinforced his opponents in the Pentagon and State Department. The British will make every effort to exploit Sputnik for an Anglo-American partnership in a heightened arms race with more testing. The Macmillan-Eisenhower talks are centered on better preparation for war, not peace, and the UN "debate" in Washington's eyes is a sideshow for simpletons.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sequel to Pugwash: A Release from the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists the Press Ignored

Soviet Scientists Appeal for World Conference on Nuclear War Danger

On October 16, the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists in Chicago sent out a press release for immediate publication containing two Soviet documents it had just received and an editorial commenting on them to be published in its forthcoming November isue. One document was a resolution passed by the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR approving a report to it by the Soviet participants in the atomic conference held last summer at Pugwash, Nova Scotia, and calling for "a broad international conference of scientists to discuss the dangers to mankind of the attempts to use atomic energy for military purposes." The other was an appeal by some 156 Soviet scientists for such a conference. Though it would seem of the greatest importance to keep open the channels of communication between scientists east and west, this release seems to have been ignored by the American press just as it largely ignored the historic Pugwash manifesto, the text of which we published in our July 22 issue, "The Scientists Warn Mankind." We print the heart of the Soviet appeal in a box below.

In commenting, Dr. Eugene Rabinowitch, editor of the Bulletin writes that the appeal "confronts the scientists of the West with a challenge" and that "the indifference and timidity of large responsible groups of scientists in the West may do as much to destroy the opportunity which now seems to offer itself as the designs of the political leadership of the East." He warns however against a new "Partisans of Peace" movement, asks the Soviet scientists for "unaccustomed restraint" and says that "scientists owe the world a more creative contribution to the resolution of the crisis—which their discoveries have helped to engender—than merely lending their voices to a chorus of slogans." At the same time he believes the scientists of the West "should not be the ones to refuse their Russian colleagues' offer to discuss in a business-like way' any proposal directed towards the prevention of an atomic war." But he concludes Western scientists have the right to hope that the discussions will be truly open-minded, without advance commitment to any slogan."

Queasy Reassurances

The Atomic Energy Commission has released a report by its Advisory Committee on Biology and Medicine which seeks to allay public fear of nuclear testing but at the same time reflects considerable misgiving. It admits that estimates of the number of individuals who will ultimately be harmed by testing "are large in absolute terms" and that how one evaluates this "depends on the ethical and emotional makeup of the individual."

The Committee's own ethical standards seem to be those of the Pentagon. It balances the harm from fallout against the benefits and decides that "if we wish to maintain a first class military organization for the safety of the country, we must at least keep abreast of new weapons developments. . . . Therefore, in terms og national security, necessary tests of nuclear weapons are justified."

The Committee feels, however, that other considerations must also be taken into account. "Radioactive fallout from tests spreads all over the world. Similarly, tests made by others affect us. Other countries may well want to develop nuclear weapons later. In time, the situation may well become serious. Estimates of ultimate damage to the world's present and future population, expressed in absolute terms, are large and impress many people." It therefore recommends that future tests "be held to a minimum consistent with scientific and military requirements."

Query: How can tests be kept within limits without agreement with Russia, which is also testing? Isn't it deceptive to talk of "scientific and military requirements" when one is talking of an arms race? The Committee talks as if there is no alternative to an arms race. This is the assumption the AEC is trying to fix in the public mind.

The small gathering at Pugwash was strikingly devoid of sloganizing. How will Western scientists respond to this invitation and will Moscow politicoes keep hands off? A genuine discussion would advance human solidarity. An exercise in party line parrotry would be disastrous.

"In Such A Tense Time . . . Scientists Cannot Remain Aside"

"The threat of atomic war grows, the armaments race and the accumulation of weapons of mass destruction accelerate; the number of powers capable of producing atomic weapons increases; the tests of nuclear weapons increase in scale. . . . It has become vitally important for scientists all over the world to warn all men of the new dimensions of the approaching danger, which threatens the health not only of those men now alive, but also of future generations of men. . . .

"We recognize that in their desire to achieve the prohibition of atomic weapons, scientists of different countries can approach this aim in a different way, that their differences of opinion in this field are based on differences of their general concepts of the world, and often directly depend on the policies of the ruling circles of their countries. This, in our opinion, should not be an insurmountable obstacle. . . .

"We believe that scientists need broad international meetings to discuss in a businesslike way the problems which worry them in connection with the dangerous effects of radiation and the threat of military use of atomic energy. A positive step in this direction was a meeting called in July of this year in Pugwash, Canada, in which some prominent scientists from the USA, England, Soviet Union, China, Japan, Australia and some other countries were present. . . .

"We support the idea of the necessity to call a conference concerning the problem of the prohibition of atomic weapons. Let not only atomic scientists of all countries, but also representatives of other disciplines: biologists, medical scientists, philosophers of all schools, economists of all schools, historians, sociologists, educators, etc., express their weighty opinions in a broad international meeting of the most important representatives of science.

"In such a tense time, full of danger of a general destructive war, scientists cannot remain aside. Their duty is to add their voice to the requests for the cessation of the atomic tests. . . ."

—(Signed) A. Nesmejanov, N. Semenov, I. Bardin, A. Topchiev, P. Kapitsa, D. Skobeltzyn, and 150 others.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dangerous Uncertainty Over Formosa; Did Russia Steal A Secret We Haven't Got?

The Democratic Platform: A Bigger Arms Race — But Without Inflation

The Democratic Advisory Policy Committee managed to discuss foreign policy without once mentioning the word "peace" or negotiation, much less co-existence; it was more cold warrish than the Republicans. It urged that budgetary considerations should not be allowed to hold down arms costs, but then turned around and on economic policy accused the Republicans of permitting inflation, though of course without suggesting price and wage controls. How do you have an arms race without inflation, or control inflation without controlling prices and wages? The question, of course, went unanswered. Its weak little three paragraph quaver on civil rights blamed Eisenhower but not Faubus for Little Rock. And these were the better minds and elder statesmen of the party! . . .

From Taipeh, Formosa, in the *New York Times* of Oct. 19, C. L. Sulzberger reported that in December, 1954, Chiang was induced to give Washington "a written guarantee not to attempt invasion except with our prior approval," but same day from the same place in the Scripps-Howard press (Wash. *Daily News* for one) Fred Sparks reported that Chiang only recently "stated he had never, in accepting our aid, promised to limit operations." The Formosa straits is a dangerous place for uncertainty. . . . Sulzberger's description of this "free world outpost" is worth filing away: "Chiang's is in effect a one-party, semi-socialist regime. Most key industries such as aluminum, sugar and power are state-owned. Private investors are therefore not attracted. . . ." Perhaps we prefer Chiang ideologically because, unlike Mao, he remains loyal to Confucius.

Our favorite quote from the new Nobel prize-winner, Albert Camus: "Every revolutionary ends by becoming either an oppressor or a heretic" (The Rebel). . . . The Supreme Court has agreed to hear the suits brought by the First Unitarian Church of Los Angeles and the Peoples Church of San Fernando Valley to test the State of California's right to impose a loyalty oath on churches to qualify for tax exemption. . . . Nixon asked a Negro newspaperman and an editor of the anti-Faubus *Arkansas Gazette* to his dinner for Queen Elizabeth. . . . New technological break-throughs in political science in the free world: In Guatamala victory for the right was assured by allowing only rightist parties to compete in the election and in Jordan (cable from Beirut, *N. Y. Times*, Oct. 19), where ten members of Parliament have been arrested, "The military authorities are said to have warned members of Parliament that any deputy who did not give a written vote of confidence to the Cabinet would be arrested as subversive. . . ."

Part of the price for closer scientific cooperation between Britain and the U. S. is likely to be the extension of U. S. style security procedures to the United Kingdom. . . . Not a word was said about freedom of the press, by Secretary Dulles when he addressed the Inter-American Press Association here though the theme of the meeting was an attack on the press gags imposed by Latin American dictators. . . . Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Paraguay, Bolivia and Venezuela were singled out as the worst offenders, but Venezuela is a U. S. oil company favorite. . . . The myth that the Soviets got the atom bomb secret by stealing it (as if it were a kind of shiplifter's item) was at least based on the fact that we had the atom bomb first. But the new myth being developed in Congressional witch hunt circles is that Russia also stole the secret of the satellite from us. Just how can one steal a secret a country does not yet possess?

Precepts for African Guests

"Don't (if an African guest in the land of the free) get thirsty, hungry or sleepy in America. If you do, find a Negro and ask him where you may be served. Failing that, try to locate a minister or priest.

"In an emergency, ask a policeman. Humbly. In the last extremity, eat and sleep in your car. Many otherwise respectable restaurants will stoop to sell you food and drink in disposable containers, for consumption off the premises. If you have no car, you might sit on the curb or lean on a mailbox while eating.

"Visitors to primitive peoples must be prepared to defer to local taboos, or risk violence at the hands of the natives, or at least a free lecture from a metropolitan newspaper. This is a free country, you know, and public restaurants cannot be restrained from turning away finance ministers. After all, you might have been merely an American citizen.

"Finally, remember that in being turned away from an inn you are in the very best company."

—From a letter by a Mr. James E. Reuter in the Baltimore Sun Oct. 19 commenting on its editorial saying it was a pity that the Finance Minister of Ghana was not "better advised" than to ask for service at a Howard Johnson's restaurant in Dover, Del.

Copies Still Available of Our Special 4-Page Analysis The New Dulles Foreign Policy

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

10/28/57

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in th U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED